

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

DOCKET NUMBER: 98-01223

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING DESIRED: NO

FEB 19 1999

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

He be given supplemental consideration for promotion to the grade of master sergeant for cycle 98E8.

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

The citations for award of the Meritorious Service Medal (MSM), the Aerial Achievement Medal, and the Aerial Achievement Medal, Third Oak Leaf Cluster, were not in his Senior Noncommissioned Officer (NCO) Selection Folder.

In support of his appeal, the applicant provided a copy of his selection folder (Exhibit A).

STATEMENT OF FACTS:
STATEMENT OF FACTS:

Information extracted from the Personnel Data System (PDS) indicates that the applicant is currently serving on active duty in the grade of master sergeant, having been promoted to that grade on 1 Nov 93. His Total Active Federal Military Service Date (TAFMSD) is 17 Aug 78.

The relevant facts pertaining to this application are contained in the letter prepared by the appropriate office of the Air Force. Accordingly, there is no need to recite these facts in this Record of Proceedings.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

The Enlisted Promotion and Military Testing Branch, AFPC/DPPPWB, reviewed this application and recommended denial.

DPPPWB indicated that the Senior NCO Evaluation Board for the 9838 promotion Cycle convened on 20 Feb 98 and promotion selections were completed on 11 Mar 98. The applicant's board score was 390.00. His total score was 663.52 and the score required for selection in his Air Force Specialty Code (AFSC) was 663.55.

According to DPPPWB, a review of the selection folder reflected that the citations for his MSM and Aerial Achievement Medal (Basic and Third Oak Leaf Cluster) were placed in the applicant's folder on 1 May 98 and were not reviewed by the Evaluation Board. These decorations were reflected on the Senior NCO Evaluation Brief and the Evaluation Board reviewed the applicant's records and assigned the 390.00 board score with full knowledge of the decorations. Consequently, no further consideration by an Evaluation Board is either appropriate or authorized.

A complete copy of the DPPPWB evaluation, with attachments, is at Exhibit B.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

In his response, the applicant indicated the decoration citations are placed in selection folders so that the board members can review them. If it is not important to have the decorations citations in the selection folders, then they should be removed from future boards for all individuals and just apply the objective point value for decorations and keep the subjectivity out of it. In the applicant's view, it is very unfair to give some people an edge and handicap others because of something that is out of their control.

Applicant's complete response is at Exhibit D.

THE BOARD CONCLUDES THAT:

1. The applicant has exhausted all remedies provided by existing law or regulations.
2. The application was timely filed.
3. Insufficient relevant evidence has been presented to demonstrate the existence of probable error or injustice. We took notice of the applicant's complete submission in judging the merits of the case. However, we agree with the opinion and recommendation of the Air Force office of primary responsibility (OPR) and adopt their rationale as the basis for our conclusion that the applicant has not been the victim of an error or injustice. We note that the contested citations were properly reflected on the Senior NCO Evaluation Brief. Therefore, it

appears the board was aware of the decorations. In view of this,, and in the absence of sufficient evidence to support a determination that the applicant's record reviewed by the Senior NCO Evaluation Board was so inaccurate or misleading that the board was unable to make a reasonable decision concerning his promotability in relationship to his peers, we find no compelling basis to recommend granting the relief sought in this application.

THE BOARD DETERMINES THAT:

The applicant be notified that the evidence presented did not demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice; that the application was denied without a personal appearance; and that the application will only be reconsidered upon the submission of newly discovered relevant evidence not considered with this application.

The following members of the Board considered this application in Executive Session on 1 Dec 98, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

Mr. Michael P. Higgins, Panel Chair
Mr. Patrick R. Wheeler, Member
Mr. William E. Edwards, Member

The following documentary evidence was considered:

Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 24 Apr 98, w/atchs.
Exhibit B. Letter, AFPC/DPPPWB, dated 13 May 98.
Exhibit C. Letter, SAF/MIBR, dated 8 May 98.



HIGGINS

Panel Chair